

### **Remarks**

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application. Claims 1-8 and 21-23 were rejected and claims 9-15 were allowed. By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

#### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-8 were rejected under § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is moot in light of the amendments to claim 1.

#### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 5-8 and 22-23 were rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,852,923 issued to Hess (hereinafter “Hess ‘923”). Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite a system having “first and second cleaning members disposed on and extending from the support plate” wherein “the first cleaning member contacts an interior surface of the housing to remove contaminants from the interior surface and the second cleaning member contacts the spindle to remove contaminants from the spindle when the rigid arbor is attached to the spindle.” Hess ‘923 does not recite a first cleaning member that contacts an interior surface of the housing to remove contaminants from the interior surface and a second cleaning member that contacts the spindle to remove contaminants from the spindle when the rigid arbor is attached to the spindle. Consequently, Applicants respectfully believe that the rejection of claim 1 is overcome. Since claims 5-8, 22 and 23 depend on claim 1, these claims are believed to be allowable for the same reasons.

#### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-7 and 22-23 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over #3956-01 Var.-Speed MultiPro Kit w/Flex-Shaft (hereinafter “Dremel”) in view of Hess ‘923. This rejection is moot in light of the amendments to claim 1. Moreover, neither the Dremel reference nor Hess ‘923, either alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests a system as claimed. For example, neither the Dremel reference nor Hess ‘923 discloses or suggests first

and second cleaning members that remove contaminants as claimed. Since claims 2-7, 22 and 23 depend on claim 1 these claims are believed to be allowable for the same reasons.

Claim 21 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dremel in view of Hess '923 and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0040017 issued to Gustafson (hereinafter "Gustafson '017"). Claim 21 depends on claim 1 and is therefore believed to be allowable for the reasons previously discussed.

### **Double Patenting Rejection**

Applicants acknowledge the provisional double patenting rejection of claims 1-3 and 5. Applicants elect to take no action since the rejection is provisional and the amendments to claim 1 are believed to render the present invention patentably distinct from U.S. Application Serial No. 10/904,459.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants have made a genuine effort to respond to the Examiner's objections and rejections in advancing the prosecution of this case. Applicants believe all formal and substantive requirements for patentability have been met and that this case is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

**GEORGE NORDSTROM et al.**

By /Matthew M. Mietzel/  
Matthew M. Mietzel  
Reg. No. 46,929  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: November 13, 2007

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400  
Fax: 248-358-3351